

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Flowers, Konecky, LaCost, McCollough, Nickerson, Shea

Absent: Berg, Fech, Franti, Lindquist, Stock

Date: Wednesday, February 9, 2011

Location: Faculty Senate Office

Note: These are not verbatim minutes. They are a summary of the discussions at the Executive Committee meeting as corrected by those participating.

1.0 Call to Order

LaCost called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Subcommittee on Campus-wide Discussions

Nickerson reported that the subcommittee will be meeting on February 17 to further work on having a campus open forum. He stated that some ideas are to invite President Spanier of the University of Pennsylvania to speak and to have the Director of Institutional Research and Planning Bill Nunez to do comparisons of UNL to the Big Ten schools. He stated that the subcommittee hopes to coordinate the upcoming CIC visit with one of the open forums and to have one of the CIC members speak to the faculty at the forum. He reported that the subcommittee is thinking of having three campus wide faculty meetings and to have a question and answer session following each meeting. These topics should help the faculty appreciate what is expected as we move into the Big Ten.

3.0 Approval of 1/26/11 Minutes

The 1/26/11 minutes were approved with revisions.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Policy on Cancelling Senate Meetings

The Executive Committee approved the following policy on cancelling Senate meetings:

“The UNL Faculty Senate shall have nine monthly meetings during the academic year in accordance with UNL bylaw 3.3.3. Cancellation of a regularly scheduled meeting can occur only if one of the following is met:

- A. Regularly scheduled classes are cancelled on the day of the meeting by the appropriate UNL authority.
- B. The President of the Senate gives 24 hours notice of cancellation. Such notice shall include justification for the cancellation.”

LaCost reported that a motion to accept the policy will be presented to the Faculty Senate at the March 1 meeting.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Objects on Loan Inventory Sheet

Schubert reported that the faculty in his department has recently been sent a form requiring faculty members to log any kind of equipment that the faculty member has. He pointed out that there is a huge amount of work associated with doing this, particularly for faculty members that have labs. He noted that his department checked with Anne Embree, Director of Budget, who reported that the request comes from Central Administration. He stated that he is hearing a lot of concerns from faculty members about this and they want the Senate to bring this issue forward. Nickerson stated that the faculty members in his department would entirely agree.

Schubert pointed out that not only is there the issue of increased workload, but it is not clear how an individual gets out from this loan situation. He questioned how pieces of equipment would ever be checked back. He noted that some labs can have thousands of pieces of equipment in it because the equipment has accumulated over time.

LaCost stated that her department has a person who is specifically assigned the task of inventorying equipment. Konecky stated that the department response could be to hire some students to do this work. She noted that this is what the University Libraries has done.

Nickerson wondered whether Central Administration's request for this information is a response to the state auditor. Schubert stated that it is a huge workload for faculty members and asked what the purpose of it is and how it could help save any money.

Nickerson stated that the Executive Committee should contact VC Jackson about this issue and bring it to her attention. He stated that some of the public might have the perception that faculty members are taking equipment.

Konecky stated that when a person leaves the university they go through an exit process. This inventory would allow tracking and then the return of the equipment associated with them as they exit.

LaCost asked if this is an issue that should be pursued. The Executive Committee agreed that the issue should be pursued and Nickerson suggested that a message be sent to VC Jackson about the concerns of the faculty.

5.2 Keys

Shea noted that relating to the loan inventory sheet is the issue of keys. He stated that he heard recently that Campus Police will be managing keys and doors for the campus. He reported that they are currently working on a test basis with several buildings on both campuses.

Shea pointed out that in a previous meeting he mentioned that his cost object number was being charged for keys given to his graduate students. He stated that he was informed that purchases of keys will no longer be done through cash payment but through cost

object numbers. He stated that the problem is that the implication is that he is now responsible for every key that is given to anyone working under his supervision.

Konecky stated that the Libraries have volunteered to be one of the test sites, once they begin testing. She stated that the Libraries Dean's office is collecting deposit money from the people issued keys to offset the charge to the Libraries' cost object number. Shea pointed out that how keys are paid for may vary among the colleges.

Schubert asked if people will now have to go to the Police department to obtain keys. Shea stated that it is his understanding that departments will have an individual assigned to manage the keys. He noted that eventually all buildings will have key card access. Konecky stated that key card access has the capability of allowing different people access to specific buildings or rooms at different hours. Anaya stated that the key card systems work because only people who are granted access can enter certain areas. She noted that the system is easy to implement.

Schubert asked why the Police department will be handling the keys. Shea stated that it probably has to do with key access being a security issue.

Shubert stated that the university should be concerned with all of the keys that are floating around outside the university. He noted that former student works, staff members, or faculty might have keys that they never returned when they left. He wondered if the locks will be changed.

Shea stated that it is his understanding that exterior entries will have key card access but most of the interior locks will not be changed in the short term.

McCullough suggested that a student fee could be assessed to those students who acquire keys for university buildings. She stated that if they do not return the key when they leave a restriction could be placed on their record keeping them from getting their grades or a degree. Anaya stated that a level of accountability needs to be built into the system.

Schubert noted that graduate students check out most keys and many can leave unexpectedly without turning a key in. He questioned what the purpose of the change is with the keys and wondered if there have been many break-ins. Shea stated that the only way to get control over the security situation is to change the locks.

The Executive Committee agreed that VC Jackson should be contacted to get clarification on the key policy and what changes are being made.

5.3 Dependent Eligibility Audit Concerns

Nickerson stated that the publicity to the campus about the audit did not provide enough information. He noted that Greg Clayton, Director, Benefits & Risk Management, reported to the Executive Committee that the company conducting the audit was able to save other universities several million dollars, yet this information was not included in the message that was sent out to the campus.

Konecky recalled VP Dietze saying that if the auditing company could not find enough savings the university will not be charged for the audit. She asked if the Executive Committee can recommend to the Chancellor that more information be provided to the campus because concerns are being raised by the faculty that could be eliminated if all of the facts are shared about the audit.

Nickerson asked if the possible savings should be mentioned. Konecky stated that this would be good information for the campus to know and would explain why the audit is being conducted.

Schubert stated that there are concerns regarding privacy of the required documents. He stated that people feel that a private company is being called in to clean up the university's administrative oversight in not requiring these documents at the time of hire.

Konecky stated that it would be helpful if the communication mentioned the other universities that have already successfully conducted the audit and how much they saved.

LaCost asked if the Executive Committee wanted to go on record that these issues be clarified. The Committee agreed.

Shea noted that there is a grace period for those who are claiming dependents illegally, but if someone is caught after this grace period they could be prosecuted which could result in more money coming back to the university. He pointed out that people illegally claiming dependents are technically committing insurance fraud. Konecky noted that the university is self insured and that those of us in the insurance pool are paying for the claims of these illegal dependents, not an outside insurance company.

5.4 Proposed Changes to Parking Permits and Services

The Executive Committee reviewed several proposed options from Parking and Transit Services regarding changes to the transit system and fee rates. McCollough noted that remote parking is set up poorly on campus resulting in few people using these lots.

Shea pointed out that if student enrollment increases parking will be more in demand and the campus will need to offer and encourage more remote parking. McCollough suggested that remote parking for freshmen and sophomores should be explored and those students choosing to park closer to their dorms should pay much higher parking rates.

LaCost noted that the Parking Advisory Committee is considering different proposals. She suggested that the Executive Committee let the Parking Advisory Committee know which of the proposals it prefers. McCollough stated that she will review the proposals and report back to the Executive Committee next week.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 16, 2011 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate

Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.